

# THE SPANISH WAR; A PROPHECY OR AN EXCEPTION?

BY THE HONORABLE DAVID J. BREWER,  
*Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.*

Address before the Liberal Club, Buffalo, New York,  
Feb. 16, 1899.

On the 18th day of April, 1898, Congress, by an overwhelming vote, passed this resolution:

“Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

“WHEREAS, The abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the Island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battleship, with 265 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Havana, and cannot longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited; therefore,

“*Resolved*, By the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

“*First*. That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

“*Second*. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once

[Published by the Anti-Imperialist League.]



relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

“*Third.* That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

“*Fourth.* That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

“Approved, April 20, 1898.”

This was the official declaration by the nation of its purpose in commencing the recent war. If thereupon Spain had withdrawn its troops from Cuba and left the people of the island free to establish their own government there would have been no war. And when as the result of the conflict Spain relinquished all dominion and control of Cuba and left her people free the purpose of the war was accomplished.

It were going too far to say that the philanthropic motive of emancipating Cuba was the sole cause of the war. Other matters tended more or less directly to precipitate the collision. Cuba had been for years in a state of chronic disturbance. Its unsettled condition had seriously interfered with our commercial relations with the island and pecuniarily damaged our interests. The fearful catastrophe of the destruction of the “*Maine*” intensified an already growing feeling. The cool, dispassionate statement of Senator Proctor, reciting the horrors which he had seen, more potent than all the tempestuous utterances of those jingo orators who shouted for war but never enlisted, strengthened the conviction that something ought to be done. And then the varied interests which always hope to profit either pecuniarily or in the line of military or naval glory by any war kept steadily working toward the same result. Yet, while all these matters are to be taken into account in determining the causes of war, the fact remains that the main thought — the officially declared purpose — was the relief of an oppressed people. And that purpose ought never to be forgotten. Whether

facts were distorted, cruelties exaggerated, the real conditions misrepresented, whether, indeed, the emergency had arisen which called for interference, are matters which may be disputed and debated, but it should never be forgotten that the American people believed that the emergency had arisen, that humanity demanded interference, and undertook the war to put an end to cruelty and wrong and for the emancipation of a struggling and down-trodden people.

When the war had commenced it was waged as other wars, and this country struck where it could, and as hard as it could. We aimed at the solar plexus, and we hit it. The proud Castilian Corbett went down, and victory is ours.

Out of this war have sprung questions affecting the future history and policy of this country — questions condensed in that which I have selected as the title of this talk: "The War with Spain; a Prophecy or an Exception?" The questions which I wish to notice are two in number, and may be stated thus: First, because we undertook the deliverance of the oppressed Cubans from the domination of Spain, are we hereafter to assume the duty of forcibly emancipating all oppressed peoples or were the circumstances surrounding our interference in Cuban affairs such as to make that simply an exception in our history and policy? Secondly, are we to extend our dominion by force, purchase, or otherwise over remote territory and enter upon that career of colonial expansion which has become the settled habit of the great European nations, or are we to remain content with our compact continental possessions and devote our energies to the development of our own resources and the building up of the United States of America within those limits along the lines of our past history?

The questions thus presented are vital and far-reaching. They are not to be settled dogmatically; by epithet or by denunciation; not by saying that what has been must be, and that changed conditions bring no change in duty or policy; nor, on the other hand, that because we are powerful, and can do so, it is destiny and duty that we should. Cant phrases do no change convictions or determine right, and the American people are not ruled by an epigram. Fortunately, these questions are being discussed without reference to party lines, and in the most earnest, patriotic, and thoughtful manner by all.

Returning to the first question, it must be noticed that

if the circumstances demanded any outside interference in the affairs of Cuba (and that they did the general consensus of opinion in this country asserted), then we were so situated that it would seem to have been our special duty to interfere; we were the near Samaritan. I know there are some who say that there is no duty of a nation as of an individual to act the part of a Samaritan; that a nation, although an aggregation of individuals, is somehow or other relieved of all obligations which rest upon an individual; that it is not only its privilege, but its duty, to be guided in all respects by selfishness; that no matter what cry of appeal may come from far or near, it is the nation's right to measure its duty, not by any questions of humanity, but by the mere rule of dollars and cents. To those who entertain such views of national right and duty any interference for the mere sake of relieving an oppressed people is necessarily an exception — one to be discountenanced and never followed.

I do not agree with those views. A nation is, in my judgment, a great moral entity, expressing in its life the sum of all the moral obligations which rest upon its individual citizens, and so there are times in the history of every nation when humanity calls upon it to look beyond the mere matter of dollars and cents, and even at personal sacrifice to interfere in the affairs of other nations. And yet, because this national duty may sometimes arise, and when it arises should always be bravely met, it does not follow therefrom that there is a continuous obligation to be looking into the affairs of other nations to see if there are not wrongs that ought to be righted, oppressed that should be delivered, and struggling people set free. The good Samaritan did not go down on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho hunting a job, but as he journeyed on his own business came where the robbed and beaten sufferer lay. It is not mere selfishness which declares that the primary duty of a nation is to its own people, and that their interests and well-being are not to be neglected under the illusive notion that it has a duty to pose as a great national rectifier of wrongs done by other nations. It is a wise man that successfully manages his own household, that has primary regard for the well-being of its inmates, and, although he may not selfishly ignore the condition of affairs of other households, yet he ought always to remember his primary duty and be cautious about interfering in the affairs of others. Every one knows that a man who is a busybody in other people's affairs, although



animated by the best of motives, is as apt to do harm as good. He often fails to appreciate the real situation, interferes in behalf of the wrong party, or interferes when interference is a curse; and the same is true of nations.

Neither is there anything in the so-called "Monroe Doctrine" which makes us sponsor for this continent. We have no supervision or control over the internal affairs of other states; we are not their guardians. Each of them has the same right to interfere in the affairs of the United States that we have to interfere in its. That doctrine finds its expression in the message of President Monroe to Congress on Dec. 2, 1823, which, after referring to the difference between the political system which obtains across the waters and that of this country, states the right which we claim in these words:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those Powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European Power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European Power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

This means only that we are unwilling that the political system of Europe shall be extended in America. We pledge non-interference with existing colonies of European governments; we simply state that their ideas of government and colonial expansion must not be worked out on this hemisphere.

Whether this doctrine has been so far approved as to become a rule of international law is one thing; it may simply have been acquiesced in because of no suitable occasion for challenge. At best it is but an expression, not of authority over this continent, but simply of protection and defence. It is a declaration of a purpose to stand by our weaker neighbors in case of attack, and in no sense an assumption of a control over their affairs. Neither have we since that message enlarged its scope. When Great Britain demanded reparation from Nicaragua

and threatened force to compel compliance, we did not interfere. In the controversy between Venezuela and Great Britain we took no new position. The former government claimed that the latter was trying to enlarge its territory wrongfully and forcibly by taking possession of that which rightfully belonged to Venezuela. We interfered only so far as to say that Great Britain should not forcibly extend its colonial possessions; and the outcome has been an arbitration between the two nations for the purpose of settling the question of right.

But the second question is of more importance, for I think it may be safely assumed that there is in the American people such a spirit of humanity and sense of responsibility that whenever there shall arise a real emergency for interference in the name of humanity in the affairs of another nation we shall respond with alacrity, and there is also such a general prudence and caution as will keep us from unwarranted and needless interference. And this second question is one whose solution will materially affect our destiny. Happily, the war with Spain is ended, and the results of the war determined. "Grim-visag'd war hath smooth'd its wrinkled front." As there were some who doubted in the beginning its wisdom or necessity, so there are some who doubt whether the results will be beneficial, and whether it was wise to take the territory which the nation has taken. But the thing is accomplished, and it is no part of a patriot to stand aloof and simply denounce. Rather let him accept that which has been accomplished and apply himself as best he may to make the things accomplished fruitful of the least injury and productive of the most blessing. Yet, while so doing, it is right and wise to consider what shall be the future, and whether that which has been done shall become the fixed habit and settled policy of the nation. What has been done is one thing. What shall be is another. We have taken islands separated from us by the waters of the ocean. Are we thus to continually expand? Is such a policy of expansion wise?

In criticising this policy I shall consider only the Philippines. I take them as illustrations, because the truth is better seen by its connection with a concrete fact than through any mere general statement. And if I refer only to the arguments against the appropriation of those islands, and fail to notice the many reasons or the peculiar circumstances which induced the action of our Govern-

ment, it is not because I do not appreciate the force of those reasons and circumstances, but because, as I said, I am not here to complain of that which has been done. I despise a man who simply sulks and swears. My thought is: Accepting that which has been done as having been the best under the circumstances, is that to become the future policy of the nation? Is it a prophecy or an exception?

One thing which seemed to attract much attention, and was claimed to justify the taking possession of distant islands, is the need of coaling-stations. When the question of annexing Hawaii was pending, distinguished officers of both the army and navy appeared before committees of Congress, urging the necessity of securing a coaling-station on those islands, and argued that we had better take the entire territory, which was small, and thus avoid the possibility of any other nation securing a post and base of operations contiguous to our own. Now, I do not propose to question the wisdom from a military standpoint of the advice given by those officers. I am ready to accept their statement that in case of war a coaling-station there, or at the Philippine islands, or elsewhere, is of value. I have had no military education; I do not know how to conduct a war; I do not edit a "yellow" journal; and so I yield unquestioning assent to the claims made by these army and navy gentlemen, that, in case of war, coaling-stations in different parts of the globe are desirable. And yet, with the incredulity and questioning spirit of a Yankee, I cannot but notice that we have gotten along safely for an hundred years without any coaling-stations outside of our own territory, and I want to ask how much greater victory Dewey would have won if we had had a dozen coaling-stations in the far Pacific? And, further, it is clear that for a coaling-station territory as large as New England is not essential. I know of but one place that needs such a large coaling-station, and that is a place we all hope to eternally avoid. But, beyond that, is there not such a thing as overdoing this getting ready for war? I have noticed that a man who goes about with a chip on his shoulder is very apt to have many quarrels, but the gentleman who minds his own business is ordinarily let alone and goes through life without a fight.

Not that I believe in tamely submitting to every injury or insult, or that a nation, like an individual, does not sometimes have to assert itself, even to the extent of war.



No more sacred duty rests upon the United States than to see that every citizen is protected, wherever he may be, and to secure such protection every dollar and every man within the limits of this country should stand pledged. I care not where an American may go, whether among the savage tribes in Africa, among the semi-civilized nations of Asia, or in the higher civilized nations of Europe, it should be understood that the banner we love is a guarantee of safety which no nation or individual can trifle with. It is said that the lives and property of American citizens in Turkey have been wantonly destroyed. If that be true reparation should be demanded. And if that be refused I would introduce Dewey to the Sultan before breakfast. And if beneath the fire of his guns the grand dome of the Mosque of St. Sophia tumbles into ruins, with all the picturesque splendor that attended the falling walls of the Temple of Jerusalem, I should only say, let all the world take warning and respect the Stars and Stripes. It is to the glory of this country that in its infancy it refused to pay tribute to the pirates of Algiers, and sent Decatur and others, who vanquished the pirates and compelled respect to our flag. And I care not how often, if necessary, that lesson of the sanctity of the Stars and Stripes is given.

Many plans are suggested for the disposal of the Philippines. One is to withdraw our army and navy and leave the inhabitants to do the best they can for themselves. Another is to continue an armed force in possession for the purpose of preserving order until such time as the inhabitants have organized and put into active operation something like a stable government. Third, while leaving the control of internal affairs to the inhabitants, to establish something in the nature of a protectorate — one that will guarantee peace within and protect against invasion from without. Fourth, to treat the islands as so much property and sell them for what we can get — selling to any responsible purchaser and one likely to establish good government in the islands. Fifth, to make them colonies, to be governed by the United States, thus introducing into the life of this nation the colonial system which obtains among European Powers. And sixth, to incorporate these islanders as fellow-citizens, establishing therein at first territories with the view of subsequent admission into the Union as States. All these plans have their advocates. The air is full of argument advocating and challenging the wisdom, legal-



ity, and constitutionality of each. I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the legality or constitutionality of any of these plans. I assume that whatever the American people determine to do in reference to these islands they will. If new laws have to be enacted or constitutions amended, all is within the power of the people, for laws and constitutions, legislators, presidents, and judges are but the means and agents by which the American people put into execution their deliberate purpose, and whatever that people determine to do they will do, and there is no power on earth that will or can stop them. Neither do I propose to say aught for or against the advisability of either of the first four plans suggested. The only matters I desire to consider are those involved in the last two propositions; namely, the introduction of the colonial system into this country and the holding of these islands as colonies of the United States, or, on the other hand, the incorporation of the people of those islands into our nationality as citizens thereof, either by their direct admission or through the intermediate process of territorial organization. Each of those propositions I believe freighted with peril, and I am glad that the determination has been made to hold those questions open for deliberate consideration, and not by hasty action to do that which once done might prove to be of lasting and irretrievable injury.

And, first, of the colonial system. Confessedly it will be a departure in the history of this country — an as yet untried experiment. It is said that the Anglo-Saxon race has manifested a capacity to govern well; that we are of that race and that, therefore, we could well govern those islands as colonies. India and Egypt are pointed to with pride as the achievements of our race in the way of government. I do not question the capacity of the race on either side of the waters to well and wisely govern others. I object to it because it antagonizes the principles upon which this Government was founded, which have controlled its life up to the present time, and the perfection of which has been the hope and aspiration of every true American. Those principles were expressed in the Declaration of Independence in these words:

“ We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among

men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Upon these immortal principles this Government was established, and we have again and again proclaimed to the world that they are the foundations upon which this Government rests, and have appealed to our prosperity and success as evidence of the justice of those principles. Somehow or other I still believe in the Declaration of Independence, and do not take kindly to a statement like the following in the September number of the Boston "Congregationalist":

"The Rev. W. T. Perrin, one of the ablest of the Methodist clergymen of Boston, defended the annexation of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and any other Spanish possessions, holding that the people of the country are realizing the absurdity of the clause in the Declaration of Independence which says that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. . . . The logic of events has made it our duty to do so, and duty is greater than theory. Government derives its powers from God, and God alone, and the nations are responsible to him."

This assumption of divine authority has been the cry of every despot from Louis XIV., who said, "I am the state," to that madcap on the German throne who is credited with saying, "Me und Gott." But with a diviner insight and a truer reverence we have believed that government derives its powers from the governed. I glory in the fact that my father was an old-line Abolitionist, and one thing which he instilled into my youthful soul was the conviction that liberty, personal and political, is the God-given right of every individual, and I expect to live and die in that faith.

I know that a Massachusetts lawyer years ago sneered at the Declaration of Independence as a collection of glittering generalities, but it takes the audacity of a Boston preacher to say in effect that the Declaration is a lie. It is true that during the century and a quarter of our existence our conduct has not been always on the plane of our avowed principles. Very few nations, as very few individuals, live up to their high ideals, but surely this has been the ideal of our life, and we have striven to make it more and more real. The great war between the States was but an effort to make those principles more far reaching in their application, and every step forward along our history has been towards a more perfect realization of this ideal. Now, government by force is the very antip-

odes of this, and to introduce government by force over any portion of the nation is to start the second quarter of the second century of our life upon principles which are the exact opposite of those upon which we have hitherto lived. It is one thing to fail of reaching your ideal; it is an entirely different thing to deliberately turn your back upon it. It is doubtless true that government by force often secures order and peace, but order and peace are not the only purpose of government. Order reigned at Warsaw. The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by the consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise rule the ignorant, the learned the unlearned, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to those whom Abraham Lincoln called "the plain people" as the ones on whose judgment to rely, and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

Ideas are, after all, the eternal forces. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem to-day of little significance, but around them gather material interests and to-morrow their power is disclosed.

It is a universal law that no family or nation will prosper whose foundation ideas are not harmonious and consistent. If conflicting, there is nothing more certain than that trouble will follow. Our own history furnishes a tremendous lesson in this direction. We commenced our national life declaring, as its foundation principle, that all men were created equal; that they possessed inalienable rights — life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But we tolerated a conflicting thought. We attempted to limit our foundation principle to white men and deny it to black. It was a compromise. It seemed a small matter. The antagonism would disappear with time. But we forgot that ideas are living forces.

William H. Seward divined the whole situation when he affirmed an "irrepressible conflict." Abraham Lincoln saw the inevitable struggle when he declared that this nation could not endure half slave and half free. And after nearly a century we paid the penalty in the awful sacrifice of the Civil War.

Shall we forget the lesson of the past? Shall we say it is a trifling matter to introduce into the life of this nation, which affirms that government derives all its powers from the consent of the governed, the thought



that that is true of only one race and not of all?—that the consent of the governed may be recognized for one portion and one race and repudiated for another portion and another race within the same dominion?

Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow. We may see a large measure of prosperity; but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

The possibility is not changed by the unquestioned fact that the Anglo-Saxon race has the capacity for governing other races, nor by the singular prosperity which has attended England in her colonial system. In comparing the two nations it must be remembered that England's colonial system commenced when the king was one in fact as well as in name. The consent of the governed was only a little factor in English life when she first reached out her hand to subdue and control other races. It was no more for the king to govern Canada and India than it was for him to govern England; and, while the consent of the governed has been struggling and growing in England, it has not even yet become the single, dominant, controlling fact of that nation's life; so that the antagonism between the two ideas of government by consent and government by force has never, in that empire, been fully developed.

With us the case is different. We stand consecrated to the single political idea of government by the consent of the governed. To introduce into the life of the nation the other thought of government by force is, at the very outset, to precipitate a conflict which, sooner or later, must inevitably result in disaster.

Neither have we been so successful in our treatment of dependent races in the past as to justify any exalted expectations for the future. We have called the Indian tribes the wards of the nation, and our best citizens have striven from the beginning of the Government to the present time to secure to them their just rights, and with what result? The eccentric Congressman from New Hampshire is credited with the statement that the Puritans marched among the Indians with a Bible in one hand and a rifle in the other. They converted those they could with the one and disposed of the rest with the other. Helen Hunt has told the story of our dealings with these

tribes in a book which she entitles "A Century of Dishonor." Are we entirely sure that a century of dishonor in respect to savages near at home will not be followed by a millennium of dishonor in respect to those beyond the seas?

To hear some talk you would think that all the influences going out from this Christian nation to the heathen have been Christian, purifying, elevating; but the fact is that even from Puritan New England there have gone more hogsheads of rum than missionaries, more gallons of whiskey than Bibles. If any one imagines that this will be changed when we come into control of the Philippines and attempt to rule them, that thereafter only missionaries and Bibles will pass thither from America, he sadly underestimates the locomotive capacity of the devil.

Again, a necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our regular army, and the first increase proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most arbitrary government in the civilized world, the Czar of the Russias, is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing an increase in its. Yet such seems to be the imperative need, if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion. We have lived and prospered for 123 years with a handful of regular troops. We have preserved peace at home and have been respected abroad. Government by consent of the governed has little need of the soldier. So the world has come to believe, and so it is. Are we ready to forfeit this high position? Do we not endanger the very foundation principles of this Government when we make the blare of the bugles and the tramp of the armed battalion the music which is heard on every side and the inspiration which attracts the ambition of our youth?

Another aspect of this question is worth noticing, and that is its relation to labor. We are facing in this country a difficult problem. The inventive spirit of our people is multiplying with marvellous rapidity labor-saving machines. By the use of them one or two skilled laborers will do the work heretofore done by many unskilled laborers. There is, therefore, a surplus of unemployed labor. The machine is supplanting the man. We are facing the fact of an increasing amount of unemployed and unskilled labor. What shall be done? China, with its enormous population, has sought to solve it by prohibit-

ing the machine. Is that the best solution we can offer? It has not a few advocates in our midst. The boycott put on the Oxley Stave Company, which resulted in litigation, going up to the Court of Appeals, in the Eighth Circuit, was founded on the fact that the company introduced machines into its manufactory for doing work which had theretofore been done by hand. The complaint indorsed by the Federation of Labor against the United States superintendent of printing and engraving is of the same nature. Everywhere we hear a claim that the cleaning of streets must be done by hand labor instead of by machine. More than one labor body has protested against the employment of women. I am not here to indorse all these, but simply to note the fact that labor realizes that it has a surplus, and is seeking to reduce it. Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes, but how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living? The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the State furnish work to all who cannot obtain it elsewhere. But the furnishing of work by the State means more taxation, and that implies added burdens on the employed to furnish support and sustenance to the unemployed.

The problem is a serious one. We have 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled colored laborers south of Mason and Dixon's line, and we find the governor of a great Northern State threatening to stand at its borders with Gatling guns and shoot down those laborers if they attempt to enter to compete with its white laborers, and this in face of the constitutional provision that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the separate States." Are we likely to aid in solving this problem by bringing into our national life 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled Malay laborers? We have shut the doors against the Chinese. Are they any worse than the Malay? Shall we introduce in this nation more cheap labor? For labor is cheap where the cost of living is cheap, and the Malay needs but a little rice within his body and a little cotton cloth outside, and a very little rice and a very little cloth is sufficient. I do not wonder at the action of the Federation of Labor in protesting against a new competition of cheap labor, as well as an increase of the army, with its



consequent increase of burden and taxation on the employed laborer.

There is a frequent expression of the thought that this proposed expansion will fill the mind of the nation with new problems and new questions, and, therefore, turn its attention away from the problems and troubles which now embarrass us. I concede it, and if turning attention away from these interior problems would solve them it were well, but I am sure it will not bring solution. Giving liquor to a man may for the time being cause him to forget his troubles, but it does not end them, and when the period of intoxication is over the troubles reappear, and generally with added force. We cannot escape these difficult problems of our internal life by looking out on the distant world. They are here and must be met and solved by patient, faithful, earnest attention. We cannot get away from them. We must overcome them. We may postpone, but we only add to the difficulties thereby.

But there is money in it. And after all this is really the most potent factor in the proposed reaching out after the islands of the Orient. The wealth of Ormus and of Ind is to-day as in the days of Milton the expectation and the dream of many. Possession of the Orient, with its accumulated wealth of centuries, dazzles the imagination and confuses the judgment. The haze of mystery hangs over that vast domain. Wealth untold is believed to be there, ready to be appropriated by any dominant power. All the nations and tribes come within Lord Salisbury's definition of dying nations, and must soon be divided between and appropriated by the living and growing nations. China is held out as a dying nation, filled with inexhaustible wealth, and why should not we share in its appropriation? What a picture this is—the eagle of liberty standing like a buzzard, to grow fat over an expected corpse? When a Washington doctor of divinity the other day in conversation with the Chinese Minister, in reference to the possession taken by Germany of part of her territory, said that it seemed to him that Russia and England were likely to follow the same example and appropriate some Chinese territory, the sarcastic reply was, "Yes, that is the way Christian nations do."

This matter of wealth has two sides to it. The poet says:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

It is not true that a mere increase of wealth foreshadows ruin and decay. It is not the possession of riches but the way in which they are accumulated that makes the menace. We have exported from this country in the last year \$1,200,000,000 worth of our products. They were the fruit of our toil of hand and brain, and the increased wealth which flows into the land as a reward for such toil carries with it no menace, but the wealth which comes without an equivalent in toil of hand or brain is the wealth which threatens. Who is injured by money? Not the one that earns it day by day, dollar by dollar, and saves until he accumulates a fortune, but he who by the chance discovery of a mine, or an accidental speculation in stocks, finds himself changed from poverty to sudden wealth; and that which is true of the individual is true of the nation. Whatever it accumulates by honest toil is not a curse. Whatever it obtains without giving value may be fruitful of injury. Exchanging bright-colored but cheap calicoes for furs and jewels may rapidly pile up wealth, but such wealth is more apt to curse than to bless.

This idea of the nation going into the midst of races and people where things of value have been heaped up during the centuries, and are possessed by those ignorant of their value, and appropriating those things, either by force or in exchange for cheap trinkets and gewgaws, is one filled with danger. The Cæsars saw the spears of their victorious legions flash in the sunlight of every known land, and in their triumphant return they brought with them the accumulated wealth of all the nations they had subdued. The splendor of imperial Rome outshone the world, but the wealth thus obtained without value given undermined the empire and the glory of Rome is simply a memory. Napoleon beheld the shining star of destiny; and then? Does human nature change through the centuries? We stand to-day facing the temptation which comes from the possibility of rapidly accumulated wealth. What right have we to anticipate that the same result will not follow if we pursue the same course of taking what we have not fully earned?

Again, this reaching out to the Orient is an implied repudiation of the Monroe doctrine, and exposes to additional perils and complications and possible wars with European nations. The scope of that doctrine I have already indicated. We have shouted ourselves hoarse in its praise and declared our willingness to fight in vindication of its principles if necessary.

It declares that we oppose any interference by European nations with states on this continent, any appropriation here of additional territory by those nations; in other words, we practically said that the Powers of the Eastern Hemisphere must keep off the Western; that in this continent the problem of government of and by and for the people was being worked out, and that any attempt by European nations to take territory and thus introduce or perpetuate European ideas of government here must be resisted. And this declaration, it must be borne in mind, was not simply in reference to the States of this Union, but to all the states and nations on this continent. When we thus formally and positively assert that the Eastern nations must keep hands off from this continent, there is an implied promise that we will keep our hands off from the other. It would be absurd to suppose that either this country or other nations understood that declaration to mean you must not come on to this continent and take any possessions, but we may come on to your continent and do as we please. The independence of one was a guarantee of the independence of the other. Now, entering the Orient to possess it is a repudiation of that doctrine, for the moment we enter there and appropriate territory, that moment it ceases to become us to insist that European nations shall keep off from this continent. We cannot either rightfully or successfully pose as a supreme dictator of the world. If we ask other nations to respect the separation of this continent, we must also respect the separation of that. Indeed, the forcible taking possession by us of islands in the West Indies or portions of South America, while not inconsistent with the Monroe Doctrine, seems a good deal like a slur upon it. When we insist that the problem of government by the people must have free course on this continent it seems hardly consistent to say that no European nation shall infringe upon that proposition, but we may. Not only will the fact of a departure from the principles of the Monroe doctrine provoke challenge on the part of European nations, but the possession of outlying territories will add to our complications with such nations. It is a matter of common knowledge that European nations are constantly in trouble between themselves by reason of differences and collisions arising between their respective colonies. England and France, England and Russia have been again and again on the point of war growing out of such troubles. We shall enter upon the same em-



barrassment and be exposed to all the complications and dangers attending.

Neither is the incorporation of these millions of ignorant Malays into our national life as fellow-citizens, even through the probationary stage of territorial existence, freighted with less of danger. The problem we have sought to work out in this nation is that of government of and by and for the people. A great nation upon that principle seems possible only under a federal system, a system which regulates all matter of local interest to the several States, and exercises through the national government only those powers and functions which make for the general welfare. We have wonderfully prospered in administering such system in a compact continental territory, each part of which has been possessed and controlled by a race capable of self-government. Imagine for one moment the outcome, if in this compact continental territory all local as well as national affairs were determined and administered in the one national capitol at Washington. Ignorance of local needs would inevitably be followed by the invasion of a lobby representing those needs, and Washington, which even now is shadowed by the presence of enormous and conflicting national interests seeking to influence and control Congress, would be turned into one vast, monumental lobby camp.

The safety of government by the people has been in local self-government. The town-meeting has perpetuated the Republic. Thus far the various States entering this federal system have been dominated by a race capable of self-government. Introduce into that system to-morrow a multitude of States whose people are confessedly incapable of self-government and you will bury it beneath the burden of local incapacity. A chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and a federal system, some of whose links are composed of States incapable of self-control, will, unless all the laws of human action are reversed, break in pieces through the weakness of the incapable links. We have had territories and kept them in a state of tutelage, but that status was continued, not until the residents thereof became capable of self-government, but until the number of the population was sufficient to justify assuming the burdens of statehood. Territorial organizations, probationary as they are, for races incapable of self-government not only repudiate the basic thought of the national life, but remain a constant and increasing menace to its successful accomplishment. Who can tell

how many centuries must pass before the savage and semi-civilized races of these islands become fit to assume the responsibilities of self-government? Is this territorial period to be permanent? Who shall say how soon the necessities of politics will transform a territory into a State? And when once brought into the Union we have links in the federal system so weak that a very little strain will snap them.

In the Union as it stands we have elements of no slight danger. We have welcomed the emigrant from all parts of the world, and in cities of the North we have an enormous population of the lowest orders of European life, unacquainted with and unfit for self-government, and a great problem is how to bring these unfit masses into a helpful addition to American life. In the South we have the rapidly increasing colored population, brought here as slaves, emancipated through the most awful drain of life and money, elevated in ignorance to citizenship, and every State south of Mason and Dixon's line to-day trembles before the unsolved question of preserving intelligent self-government and at the same time guaranteeing rights of citizenship to an ignorant mass. With these problems resting upon and burdening the nation is it wise to throw upon it the awful problem of dealing with millions far more incapable of and unused to self-government? Can we expect to find safety in adding to our difficulties? Can we relieve against one problem of dealing with ignorant and unfit masses here by adding millions more to the problem? This is no trifling question and is not answered by any gush about duty and destiny; in fact, all this talk about destiny is wearisome. We make our own destiny. We are not the victims, but the masters, of fate, and to attempt to unload upon the Almighty responsibility for that which we choose to do is not only an insult to Him, but to ordinary human intelligence. We are told we have become so great and powerful that the world needs us, but what the world most needs is not the touch of our power, but the blessings of our example. It needs the bright example of a free people not disturbed by any illusions of territorial acquisition, of pecuniary gain, or military glory, but content with their possessions and striving through all the abilities, activities, and industries of their wisest and most earnest to make the life of each individual citizen happier, better, and more content. My friends, two visions rise before me: One of a nation growing in population, riches, and strength; reaching out

the strong hand to bring within its dominion weaker and distant races and lands; holding them by force for the rapid wealth they may bring—with perhaps the occasional glory, success, and sacrifice of war; a wondrously luxurious life into which the fortunate few shall enter; an accumulation of magnificence which for a term will charm and dazzle, and then the shadow of the awful question whether human nature has changed, and the old law, that history repeats itself, has lost its force, whether the ascending splendor of imperial power is to be followed by the descending gloom of luxury, decay, and ruin. The other of a nation where the spirit of the Pilgrim and the Huguenot remains the living and controlling force, affirming that the Declaration of Independence, the farewell address of the Father of his Country, and the Monroe doctrine shall never pass into innocuous desuetude; devoting its energies to the development of the inexhaustible resources of its great continental territory; solving the problem of universal personal and political liberty, of a government by the consent of the governed, where no king, no class, and no race rules, but each individual has equal voice and power in the control of all, where wealth comes only as the compensation for honest toil of hand or brain, where public service is private duty; a nation whose supreme value to the world lies not in its power, but in its unfailing loyalty to the high ideals of its youth, its forever lifting its strong hand, not to govern, but only to protect the weak; and thus the bright shining which brightens more and more into the fadeless eternal day.

Brethren, Ebal and Gerizim are before us. Might and right stand on either side with their great appeals.

“ To every man and nation comes the moment to decide,  
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;  
Careless seems the great Avenger; history's pages but record  
One death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the Word;  
Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,  
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,  
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own.

“ We see dimly in the present what is small and what is great,  
Slow of faith how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of fate,  
But the soul is still oracular; and amid the market's din,  
List the ominous stern whisper from the Delphic cave within,  
' They enslave their children's children who make compromise with  
sin.' ”

Paraphrasing in part the invocation which attends the opening of the Supreme Court, God save the United



States of America and keep them from the road so often travelled by nations, of increasing territory, accumulating dominion, rapidly and easily acquired wealth, luxurious splendor, a growing separation between the poor and the rich, presaging decay and death; and may we always hear the solemn prayer of Abraham Lincoln, borne upward to Heaven from the consecrated field of Gettysburg upon the mighty volume of patriotic incense which ever rises from that sacred spot, that government of and by and for the people may never perish from the earth!

“God of our fathers, known of old,  
 Lord of our far-flung battle line,  
 Beneath whose awful hand we hold  
 Dominion over palm and pine —  
 Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
 Lest we forget — lest we forget.

“Far-called our navies melt away,  
 On dune and headlands sinks the fire;  
 Lo! all our pomp of yesterday  
 Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!  
 Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,  
 Lest we forget — lest we forget!

“If, drunk with sight of power, we loose  
 Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe —  
 Such boasting as the Gentiles use,  
 Or lesser breeds without the Law —  
 Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
 Lest we forget — lest we forget!”







